



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,391	06/20/2003	Andreas Nickel	BAYER 10260-WCG	8238
27386	7590	08/10/2010	[REDACTED]	
GERSTENZANG, WILLIAM C.			EXAMINER	
NORRIS MC LAUGHLIN & MARCUS, PA			NAGPAUL, JYOTI	
875 THIRD AVE, 8TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10022			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/10/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/600,391	NICKEL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JYOTI NAGPAUL	1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 2,4-11, 13-16 and 18-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-25 and 28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 2,4-11, 13-16 and 26-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Amendment filed on June 1, 2010 has been acknowledged. Claims 2, 4-11, 13-16 and 26-27 are pending. Claims 18-25 and 28 have been withdrawn from consideration as drawn to non-elected subject matter.

Response to Amendment

Rejection of Claims 4-5, 7-9 and 26-27 as being unpatentable over Filippi (US 3536611) in view of Borrelli (US 6350618) and further in view of Garcera (US 4640774) has been modified in light of applicants' amendments.

Rejection of Claims 2, 6, 12 and 15 as being unpatentable over Filippi (US 3536611) in view of Borrelli (US 6350618) and further in view of Garcera (US 4640774) as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Taketomo has been modified in light of applicants' amendments.

Rejection of Claims 10-11 and 16 are as being unpatentable over Filippi (US 3536611) in view of Borrelli (US 6350618) and further in view of Garcera (US 4640774) as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Hersey (US 4990412) has been modified in light of applicant's amendments.

Rejection of Claims 13-14 as being unpatentable over Filippi (US 3536611) in view of Borrelli (US 6350618) and further in view of Garcera (US 4640774) as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Shay (US 4310607) has been modified in light of applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. **Claims 4-5, 7-9 and 26-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filippi (US 3536611) in view of Borrelli (US 6350618) and further in view of Garcera (US 4640774).

Filippi teaches a separation module comprising at least one bundle (24) comprising a plurality of porous ceramic capillaries (36) arranged in parallel. (Refer to Col. 3, Line 44 and Col. 6, Line 4) Filippi teaches each of the porous ceramic capillaries (36) in the bundle (24) being spaced apart (interstitial open areas as disclosed in Filippi) from an adjacent ceramic capillary in the bundle (24) by a defined distance. Filippi further teaches the module comprises a housing (10), which housing encloses the bundle (24), the housing having an inlet and/or outlet pipe in fluid communication with the inside of the porous ceramic capillaries for a first material flow and/or an outlet pipe in fluid communication with the (interstitial open areas) inner space between the ceramic capillaries for a second material flow. (Refer to Figure 1)

Filippi fails to teach sintered capillaries. Filippi fails to teach the capillaries are joined together by staggered ceramic film strips pressed at least partially around and connecting adjacent capillaries. The staggered ceramic film strips being wound into the at least one bundle, the staggered ceramic film strips when wound into the at least one bundle functioning as baffle plates. Filippi further fails to teach each of the sintered ceramic capillaries in the bundle having an external diameter ranging from 0.3 mm to 10 mm and an internal diameter ranging from 0.1 mm to 8 mm. Filippi fails to teach that each of the sintered ceramic capillaries in the bundle being spaced apart from an adjacent sintered ceramic capillary in the bundle by a defined distance established by the ceramic film strips. Filippi further fails to teach an end of each of the sintered ceramic capillaries passing through an end plate at a defined distance from an end of an adjacent sintered ceramic capillary also passing through the end plate.

Borrelli teaches a capillary reservoir device comprising cells of ceramic material.

Borrelli teaches the formation of the cells comprises sintering to meld the ceramic material while keeping the shape of the reservoir. (Refer to Col. 4, Lines 34-67 to Col. 5, Lines 1-5)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to sinter the capillaries of Filippi in order to ensure the shape of the capillary.

Filippi and Borelli fail to teach the capillaries are joined together by staggered ceramic film strips pressed at least partially around and connecting adjacent capillaries. The staggered ceramic film strips being wound into the at least one bundle, the staggered ceramic film strips when wound into the at least one bundle functioning as baffle plates. Filippi and Borelli further fail to teach that each of the sintered ceramic capillaries in the bundle having an external diameter ranging from 0.3 mm to 10 mm and an internal diameter ranges from 0.1 mm to 8 mm. Filippi and Borelli fail to teach that each of the sintered ceramic capillaries in the bundle being spaced apart from an adjacent sintered ceramic capillary in the bundle by a defined distance established by the ceramic film strips. Filippi and Borelli further fail to teach an end of each of the sintered ceramic capillaries passing through an end plate at a defined distance from an end of an adjacent sintered ceramic capillary also passing through the end plate.

Filippi teaches the ceramic capillary tubes are woven with a thread (38) with the tubes being generally parallel to each other to form a defined distance (interstitial open areas) and then rolled to form a bundle (34) and the ends are treated with a resinous material to form an end plate (common headers (26 and 28)). Fillipi further teaches that

the tube being woven is used for preventing them from moving apart. (Refer to Col. 3, Lines 43-45, Col. 4, Lines 55-57 and Col. 4, Lines 45-50)

Garcera teaches an assembly of tubular filter member inside an envelope comprising capillaries (filter members) that are sintered and then joined together by staggered ceramic film strips pressed at least partially around and connecting adjacent capillaries so that they don't move under the effect of pressure differences, pressure rises and falls, occasional hammering or shock waves and also differential thermal expansions. (Refer to Col. 6, Lines 64-66 and Col. 7, Lines 13-26) Garcera further teaches sintered ceramic capillaries having an external diameter ranging from 0.3 mm to 10 mm and an internal diameter ranges from 0.1 mm to 8 mm. (Refer to Col. 4, Lines 58-60)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to substitute the thread of the modified Fillipi device with staggered ceramic film strips in order to prevent movement of the ceramic capillaries under the effect of pressure differences, pressure rises and falls, occasional hammering or shock waves and also differential thermal expansions.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the modified sintered ceramic capillaries of Filippi and Borelli having an external diameter ranging from 0.3 mm to 10 mm and an internal diameter ranges from 0.1 mm to 8 mm in order to obtain a compact unit and improve good fluid distribution within the device.

5. **Claims 2, 6, 12 and 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filippi (US 3536611) in view of Borrelli (US 6350618) and further in

view of Garcera (US 4640774) as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Taketomo.

Refer above for the teachings of Filippi, Borelli and Garcera.

As for claim 2, Filippi, Borelli and Garcera fail to teach the end plate is a perforated plate and wherein the distance between the sintered ceramic capillaries is further kept constant by spacers and fail to teach the distance is less than 3 mm.

Taketomo teaches a separation module. The module comprises sheet/spacers (26) at several points along the length of the capillaries so that the individual capillaries are spaced apart by a small distance. (See Figure 10 and Col. 1, Lines 50-55) The module further teaches the bottom of the capillaries is securely embedded in a support/end plate (29) for “close packing” in order to provide a sufficient space between each capillary and thus ensuring a gas passage from the outside to the inside of the capillary. (See Col. 2, Lines 5-20)

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide end plates as disclosed in Taketomo to provide a sufficient space between each capillary and thus ensuring a gas passage from the outside to the inside of the capillary.

6. **Claims 10-11 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filippi (US 3536611) in view of Borrelli (US 6350618) and further in view of Garcera (US 4640774) as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Hersey (US 4990412).

Refer above for the teachings of Filippi, Borelli and Garcera.

Filippi, Borelli and Garcera fail to teach wherein the sintered ceramic capillaries have, on the inside, a thin membrane having separation activity and the sintered ceramic capillaries have, on the outside, a thin membrane having separation activity.

Hersey teaches a cryogenic compressor for compressing hydrogen and oxygen comprising porous tubes with thin catalytic membranes (124, 136 and 144). (Refer to Col. 7, Lines 57-69)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the modified device of Filippi with a thin membrane having catalytic activity on the inside and outside of the capillary in order to further versatile the functionality of the device.

7. **Claims 13-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filippi (US 3536611) in view of Borrelli (US 6350618) and further in view of Garcera (US 4640774) as applied to claim 27 above, and further in view of Shay (US 4310607).

Refer above for the teachings of Fillipi, Borelli and Garcera.

Fillipi, Borelli and Garcera fail to teach the housing consists of stainless steal.

Shay teaches a separator bundle comprising a bundle of capillary fibers. Shay further teaches a stainless steel housing (34) that encloses the bundle of capillary fibers.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the modified device of Fillipi to provide a stainless steel housing enclosing the bundle in order to use the separator module in a battery cell as disclosed in Shay.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed June 1, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants have amended the claims to recite "porous ceramic capillaries". Filippi teaches in col. 5, lines 61 to Col. 6, lines 1-5, the composition of the capillary tubes is ceramic. With regards to the recitation "porous" this is an inherent property in ceramic composites. Applicants argue that Filippi does not teach that the distance between the capillaries are "defined". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Filippi teaches in col. 4, lines 33-36 that thread circumferentially surrounds each tube thereby providing the dimension of the uniform intestinal area 44 that is equivalent to applicant's recitation of "defined distance" between the capillaries. In response to applicant's arguments that the examiner has not provided any reason why a person of one ordinary skill in the art would have used sintered ceramic capillaries to replace those as used in the Filippi reference. First, examiner would like to point out that Filippi teaches securing the tubes by the method of woven, sintered, braided, knitted, glued or otherwise secured as disclosed in col. 2, Lines 30-31. Notwithstanding, Borelli teaches the method of sintering powder particles such as ceramic into channels to form a reservoir. The reference of Borelli teaches a method of sintering ceramic materials. The examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge. In this case, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art to form a bundle of ceramic capillaries of Filippi with the sintering method described in Borelli in order to ensure that the shape of the capillary bundle is intact. It is reminded that applicants are claiming an apparatus statutory class of invention, it is the structural limitations of the apparatus which are considered in determining the patentability of the apparatus itself. Applicants argue that it is apparent that the Garcera reference does not disclose the capillaries *being in a sintered state before being* arranged in a "member". This is a method of forming the article and is of no patentable significance to an apparatus claim.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JYOTI NAGPAUL whose telephone number is (571)272-1273. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday (10:00-7:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jyoti Nagpaul/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797